

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mater Academy At Mount Sinai



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Mater Academy At Mount Sinai

4300 ALTON RD, Miami Beach, FL 33140

www.matermountsinai.com

Demographics

Principal: Eileen Hernanadez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-08-01
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Mater Academy At Mount Sinai

4300 ALTON RD, Miami Beach, FL 33140

www.matermountsinai.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	83%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To develop the intellectual and social skills of its students by facilitating a rigorous curriculum and a wide range of educational resources within a safe learning environment, to enable students to perform at or above grade level, availing success within a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Mater Academy is to provide students a viable educational choice that offers an innovative, rigorous, and seamless college preparatory curriculum, providing Mater students, at every level from PK-12th grade, with a competitive advantage against their contemporaries. To that end, Mater Schools strive to:

- create a thirst for knowledge in all disciplines;
- kindle the art of thinking and serve as a springboard for lifelong learning; and
- deliver and enrich every student with a sense of purpose, a belief in their own efficacy, and a commitment to the common good.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hernandez, Eileen	Principal	<p>The principal, Eileen Hernandez, will schedule and facilitate regular RtI meetings, ensure attendance of team members, ensure follow up of action steps, and allocate resources. In addition to Mater Academy at Mount Sinai's Leadership Team includes the following members who will carry out SIP planning and MTSS problem solving.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • special education program specialist • school psychologist • department head teachers <p>In addition, the Leadership Team members will meet to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level MTSS.</p> <p>All MTSS Leadership Team members will conduct regular meetings to evaluate intervention efforts for students by subject, grade, intervention, or other logical organization. In addition to those selected other teachers will be involved when needed to provide information or revise efforts.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/14/2013, Eileen Hernanadez

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-08-01
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	45	26	25	18	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Number of students enrolled														
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	87%	62%	57%	75%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	76%	62%	58%	72%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	58%	53%	0%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	90%	69%	63%	81%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	92%	66%	62%	81%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75%	55%	51%	0%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	55%	53%	0%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	60%	29%	58%	31%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	88%	64%	24%	58%	30%
	2018	76%	60%	16%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	83%	60%	23%	56%	27%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	67%	19%	62%	24%
	2018	85%	67%	18%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	69%	23%	64%	28%
	2018	83%	68%	15%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	92%	65%	27%	60%	32%
	2018	79%	66%	13%	61%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	53%	18%	53%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	56%	1%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	81			81							
BLK	60			80							
HSP	89	71		89	89		76				
FRL	81	63		83	90	70	71				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	50			67							
HSP	72	81		85	65						
FRL	65	77		76	60		50				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
ELL	90			80							
BLK	46	70		54	90						
HSP	83	79		88	83						
FRL	70	68		74	86						

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	81
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	83
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	76
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance was shown by the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile of students on the Spring 2019 FSA English Language Arts Assessment. The factors that contributed to these scores include the lack of instructional space to deliver interventions, the strength of the intervention curriculum and the lack of training on intervention and provided curriculum.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest decline in performance was shown from the Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students on the Spring 2019 FSA English Language Arts learning gains. These students went from a 77% in 2018 to 63% in 2019. The factors that contributed to these scores include the lack of instructional space to deliver interventions, the strength of the intervention curriculum and the lack of training on intervention and provided curriculum.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap in comparison to the state was indicated by the Spring 2019 FSA English Language Arts achievement. The school implemented cross-curricular reading skills, Reading and Language Arts professional development, critical thinking strategies and instructional programs for intervention, such as iReady Reading.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The learning gains on the Spring 2019 FSA Math Assessment showed the greatest improvement in performance, from 68% in 2018 to 92% in 2019. The school implemented intervention with fidelity for students in Math through iReady and Ten Marks.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students with 2 or more EWS indicators as well as a focus on students who scored a Level 1 and 2 on the 2019 Spring FSA Math Assessment.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA Achievement for lowest 25%
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. Science Achievement
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing the 2019 school wide data, it was evident that there was a decrease in the achievement of the lowest 25th percentile on the FSA English Language Arts Assessment. The students were impacted by the insufficient training for teachers on intervention implementation.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to increase the achievement of the lowest 25th percentile on the FSA English Language Arts portion from 58% to 61%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy that will be implemented is increased interventions in the area of English Language Arts. Students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA English Language Arts Assessment, or who were retained will be participating in daily English Language Arts Interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicated that students struggling with English Language Arts may benefit from early interventions aimed at improving their English Language Arts ability and ultimately preventing subsequent failure.

Action Steps to Implement

The school leadership team will identify students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA English Language Arts Assessment.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will monitor fidelity of the interventions by completing regular walk-throughs, data chats, and observations of the interventions taking place.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will assign interventionist to provide remediation for 30 minutes daily

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will analyze iReady diagnostic assessments three times per year, as well as Growth Monitoring assessment every 21 days to monitor progress being made.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing the 2019 school wide data, it was evident that there was a decrease in the achievement of the FSA English Language Arts Assessment, specifically in students that receive Free and Reduced Lunch. The students were impacted by the insufficient training for teachers on intervention implementation.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to increase the achievement on the FSA English Language Arts Assessment for students on Free and Reduced Lunch from 63% to 66%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy that will be implemented is increased interventions in the area of English Language Arts for students on Free and Reduced Lunch.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicated that the students struggling with English Language Arts may benefit from early interventions aimed at improving their ELA ability and ultimately preventing subsequent failure.

Action Steps to Implement

The school leadership team will identify students on Free and Reduced Lunch who did not make learning gains on the 2019 FSA English Language Arts Assessment.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will assign interventionists to provide extra support for students on Free and Reduced Lunch who did not make learning gains.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will monitor the fidelity of interventions by completing regular walk-throughs, data chats, and observations of interventions.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will analyze iReady diagnostic assessments three times per year and Growth Monitoring every 21 days.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing the 2019 school wide data, it was evident that improvement needs to be made in the area of science achievement. The students were impacted by the insufficient training for teachers on intervention implementation.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to increase the science achievement from 71% to 74%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy that will be implemented is increased professional development for teachers in the area of science as well as an intervention program and strategies in order to focus on students that are not

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that students will benefit from increased involvement in professional development by teachers and the early implementation of interventions. Identify areas of improvement and providing intervention for these areas will ultimately prevent subsequent failure.

Action Steps to Implement

The school leadership team will identify students in 5th grade that are at risk of failure on the state science assessment as evident on the Science Baseline Assessment.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will provide science teachers with professional development to target areas of improvement and to focus on science interventions and small groups.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

The school leadership team will monitor big idea science assessment scores for students at risk of failure to perform on the state science assessment.

Person Responsible Eileen Hernandez (923546@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will monitor data for student's who had 2 or more early warning signs as well as students who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2019 Spring FSA Math. Data chats will be conducted and teachers and students will be aware of progress and/or areas of focus and improvement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Mater Academy at Mount Sinai learns about students' cultures by conducting school events centered around students and their families.

The school builds relationships between teachers by engaging everyone in discussions, participating in Professional Learning Communities, and allowing teachers to collaborate together while taking the lead in what interests them in terms of curriculum implementation for the school.

The school builds relationships between students by building character development, encouraging students to do their best, school activities, and working collaboratively in the classroom.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$7,920.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1382	690-Computer Software	5054 - Mater Academy At Mount Sinai	General Fund		\$5,880.00
			<i>Notes: iReady License- \$5880.00</i>			
	1382	690-Computer Software	5054 - Mater Academy At Mount Sinai	General Fund		\$2,040.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Teacher Toolbox- \$2040.00</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$7,920.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1382	690-Computer Software	5054 - Mater Academy At Mount Sinai	General Fund		\$5,880.00
			<i>Notes: iReady License- \$5880.00</i>			
	1382	690-Computer Software	5054 - Mater Academy At Mount Sinai	General Fund		\$2,040.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Teacher Toolbox- \$2040.00</i>			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$15,840.00